

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/645,605	BLUM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James O. Hansen	<b>Art Unit</b> 3637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James O. Hansen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (2) Mr. Douglas Hahm. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 22,37 and 44.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rock et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JAMES O. HANSEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In an effort to expedite the prosecution process [compact prosecution], the examiner contacted applicant's representative and proposed adding the limitations of claim 37 into both independent claims 22 & 44 so as to obviate a potential prior art rejection in view of Rock et al., '750, and to further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art made of record. Applicant agreed to the proposed changes and as such, the application has been placed in condition for allowance [see attached examiner's amendment]. It is noted that after further review, consideration and discussion with applicant's representative, the claims are deemed to be definite and the previous 112(2) rejections have been vacated [note applicant's remarks filed June 18, 2007] .